

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of any changes to the claims and the remarks herein. Please contact the undersigned to conduct a telephone interview in accordance with MPEP 713.01 to resolve any remaining requirements and/or issues prior to sending another Office Action. Relevant portions of MPEP 713.01 are included on the signature page of this amendment.

Attached herewith is a Declaration and Power of Attorney of inventor, Bruce Furman, who is the only inventor not signing the original Declaration.

The claim of priority has been amended as suggested by the Examiner and the information on the referred co-pending applications at page 20 has been amended.

Attached herewith are Terminal Disclaimers over patents US 5,932,143, US 5,928,566, US 6,210,606 and US Application Serial Number 09/208,528 in response to the obvious type double patenting rejections.

Claims 1-23 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 92/22911 in view of either the Handbook of Common Polymers, Roff, W.J., et al. editors, 1971, Butterworth & Co., pp. 515-517 (hereinafter "the Handbook") or Kirk-Othmer, Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology, 3rd. ed., 1982, John Wiley & Sons, pp. 111-115.

The Examiner states the "WO 92/22911 teaches electroconductive structures comprising *inter alia*, electroconductive polymers such as polyaniline and additives such as plasticizers (p. 16, line 4 through p. 23, line 12; and p. 36, line 21 through p. 37, line 16). Different articles are taught at p. 11, line 17 through p. 12, line 20." There is no teaching, suggestion, motivation for or incentive for Applicants' claimed invention therein. There is no reference to a polycrystalline material having interstitial regions containing amorphous material as claimed by Applicants.

Serial No. 09/727,615

Docket No. YOR919960050US3

The Examiner states that "The Handbook teaches plasticizers such as glycerol triacetate (a.k.a. "triacetin") and epoxidized soybean oil at p. 516." There is no teaching, suggestion, motivation for or incentive for Applicants' claimed invention therein. There is no reference to a polycrystalline material having interstitial regions containing amorphous material as claimed by Applicants.

The Examiner states that " The Encyclopedia teaches plasticizers such as epoxidized soybean oil and glycol derivatives at p. 114." There is no teaching, suggestion, motivation for or incentive for Applicants' claimed invention therein. There is no reference to a polycrystalline material having interstitial regions containing amorphous material as claimed by Applicants.

The Examiner further states that "WO 92/22911 may not specifically teach the particular plasticizers presently claimed as additives. Nevertheless, either the Handbook or the Encyclopedia documents the fact that glycerol triacetate, epoxidized soybean oil, glycol derivatives and other compounds are well-known plasticizers for polymers. The person skilled in the art is deemed to have been aware of those well-known material and their uses." That a person of skill in the art may in general know of plasticizers and their uses does not mean that a person of skill in the art are taught to, suggested to, motivated to or provide incentive for making a polycrystalline material having interstitial regions comprising amorphous material as claimed by Applicants. The fact that the Examiner states that "WO 92/22911 may not specifically teach the specific plasticizers presently claimed" is clear evidence that WO 92/22911 provides no teaching, suggestion, motivation for or incentive for Applicants' claimed invention.

The Examiner further states that "The references may or may not specifically teach the particular combination presently claimed. Nevertheless, the teachings of the references would include that combination among a limited number of possibilities in the section cited above. One skilled in the art therefore would have had a reasonable

Serial No. 09/727,615

Docket No. YOR919960050US3

expectation of success with respect to the invention as presently claimed." The Examiner has acknowledged that WO 92/22911 provides no teaching, suggestion, motivation for or incentive for Applicants' claimed invention by saying that WO 92/22911 "may or may not teach the particular combination presently claimed." Even if it is true as the Examiner says "that the teachings of the references would include that combination among a limited number of possibilities" the reference provides no teaching, suggestion, motivation for or incentive for a polycrystalline material with interstitial regions containing an amorphous material as claimed by Applicants. Thus, a person of skill in the art would not have a reasonable expectation of success. The Examiner refers to 17 pages from WO 92/22911; one page from the Handbook and one page from the Encyclopedia. This is not a limited number of possibilities. How would a person of skill in the art know which combinations to choose?

The Examiner further states that "WO 92/22911 may not specifically teach the polycrystalline, amorphous interstitial regions, isotropic, crystallinity, physical properties, crystallite sizes, or structures presently claimed." The Examiner here is acknowledging the reference provides no teaching for Applicants' claimed invention. The Examiner further states, "Nevertheless, the reference is deemed to teach or suggest the claimed composition." This is conjecture on the Examiner's part. The Examiner further states "Applicant or Applicants need to show that his, her or their invention is actually different from and unexpectedly better than the prior art." The Examiner has the burden of showing that the references provide a teaching, suggestion, motivation or incentive for a polycrystalline material having interstitial regions containing amorphous material. The Examiner has not done so. Applicants do not have to show that their invention is unexpectedly better than the teaching of references that provide no teaching, suggestion, motivation or incentive for their claimed invention. Notwithstanding, Applicants have shown that their invention is unexpectedly better. Applicants have shown that they have unexpectedly formed a polycrystalline material.

Serial No. 09/727,615

Docket No. YOR919960050US3

Page 12 of 22

The Examiner further states "the references may not specifically teach the particular ranges presently claimed. However, no criticality has been shown for the presently claimed ranges over the closest prior art, and optimization of results would have been obvious to one skilled in the art. Overlapping ranges also may establish *prima facie* obviousness." The Examiner has not shown *prima facie* obviousness since the Examiner has not shown where there is a teaching, suggestion, motivation for or incentive for a polycrystalline material having amorphous interstitial regions. Criticality does not have to be shown over art which provides no teaching of Applicants' invention. The Examiner has pointed to no overlapping ranges. Applicants have shown criticality - a polycrystalline material with amorphous interstitial regions.

The Examiner further states that "the level of ordinary skill in the relevant art is resolved with the finding that, based on the teachings of WO 92/22911 in view of either the Handbook or Encyclopedia as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of such skill for a structure to fall within the limitations presently claimed because WO 92/22911 teaches structures comprising electroconductive polymers such as polyaniline and additives such as plasticizers, while the Handbook and Encyclopedia both document the fact that certain plasticizers are well-known in the art." The Examiner has not shown where in the teaching of the cited references there is a teaching, suggestion, motivation for or incentive for a polycrystalline material having interstitial regions containing amorphous material.

The Examiner's reasons for rejection based on WO 92/22911, The Handbook and the Encyclopedia are based on hindsight reconstruction which is impermissible to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Applicant's invention is directed to polycrystalline material with amorphous interstitial regions. The Examiner must show what in the teaching of the cited references would lead a person of skill in the art to this invention. The Examiner has not done this. The Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness. How could a person of skill in the art be directed to an invention having crystalline regions when the references have no teaching on crystalline

Serial No. 09/727,615

Docket No. YOR919960050US3

Page 14 of 22

regions? The Examiner has failed to meet the burden for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103.

In view of the remarks herein withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1-23 under 35 USC 103(a) in view of WO 92/22911, the Handbook and the Encyclopedia is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-17 and 19-23 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) and 35 USC 103(a) in view of US Patent 5,484,884 to MacDiarmid et al. MacDiarmid is directed to extraction of emeraldine base with THF followed by NMP. (See Col. 2, lines 40-49) which is not the inclusion of an additive which "provides mobility to said polymer to allow said polymer to associate with one another to achieve said crystalites" as claimed by Applicants. Extraction with THF and NMP as taught by MacDiarmid provides no teaching, suggestion, motivation for or incentive for Applicants' claimed invention. Why would a person of skill in the art know from MacDiarmid that adding an additive will result in crystalites when an extraction process is a process of removal of something? See Attachment A for a definition of extraction from Howley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary (1987). The Examiner does not answer this question. In view thereof withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 12-17 and 19-23 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) and 103(a) over Epstein et al. (4,913,867). Epstein is directed to stretch orientation which results in an increase in electrical conductivity in the stretch direction as compared to the direction perpendicular to the stretch direction. This results from the stretching pulling the polymer chains in the stretch direction which elongates the polymer in the stretch direction resulting in an increase in order in that direction which results in the increase in electrical conductivity in the stretch direction. Applicants acknowledge that stretch orientation was known prior to Applicants' invention. Epstein does not teach use of an additive as taught by Applicants. The Examiner refers to Epstein Col. 2, lines 60-65, where Epstein refers to NMP as a plasticizer. The NMP is being used as a solvent as is evident from Epstein Col. 3, lines 11-15. NMP is a well

Serial No. 09/727,615

Docket No. YOR919960050US3

know solvent for emeraldine base. Epstein's invention is heating and stretching at the same time to enhance the effect of stretching the film to form a crystalline polyaniline film. Epstein does not teach use of an additive added to a solvent used to form a polycrystalline film as taught by Applicants. On page 17 of Applicants' specification, they teach Polyaniline Base in NMP and Polyaniline Base in NMP/Plasticizer. The NMP/Plasticizer combination has the effect claimed by Applicants while the NMP alone does not have the effect claimed by Applicants. There is no teaching or suggestion in Epstein that there is an increase in the crystallinity of the polyaniline prior to heating and stretching. Epstein teaches that there is no such effect since Epstein teaches at the top of Col. 3 that slow heating results in less crystallinity and rapid heating results in greater crystallinity. Moreover, Applicants claim a polycrystalline structure, that is one that has a plurality of crystallites with amorphous regions between the crystallites. There is no teaching, suggestion, motivation for or incentive for such a structure in Epstein. In view thereof withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The description of Fig. 5, at the bottom of page 8, states that Fig 5(a) shows an amorphous film (essentially no crystallinity for a film processed from NMP) (See the last paragraph at page 12) and Fig. 5(c) shows a highly crystalline film for a film process in NMP with 10% poly-co-dimethyl-propylamine siloxane. (See the last paragraph on page 14). The references cited by the examiner refer to NMP as a plasticizer. This is more typically called a solvent. But they do not teach NMP in combination with another additive, such as what Applicants refer to as a plasticizer. Thus, what the cited references refer to as a plasticizer does not work to achieve the unexpected result discovered by Applicant which for the data shown in Fig. 5 results from a combination of different constituents (that is a solvent and a plasticizer) for which there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited references. Claim 18 specifically includes the Fig. 5 example.

Claims 1-20 and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Angelopoulos et al. (5,804,100).

Serial No. 09/727,615

Docket No. YOR919960050US3

Claim 21 as presented herein should be re-included with claims under examination.

The Examiner states:

With respect to Angelopoulos et al. (5,804,100), the Examiner respectfully maintains that this reference is available under 102(e). The newly referenced CIP parent applications do not support the instant claims in their entirety. In order to provide support for the claimed invention, an application must disclose/describe each and every claim limitation present.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The present CIP application names all the inventors of US 5,804,100. Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's comments. But to the extent that the Examiner is correct in stating that part of the current claims are supported by US 5,804,100 that part correspond to the inventors of US 5,804,100 who are inventors of the present application and thus as to that part of the current claims US 5,804,100 is not a 102(e) reference since both have the same inventive entity. Moreover, that part of the present claims that do not correspond to the teaching of US 5,804,100 is not anticipated by US 5,804,100 and could at best be obvious over US 5,804,100. But since US 5,804,100 is assigned to the assignee of the present invention, as a 102(e) reference, it cannot support a 35 USC 103(a) rejection. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner further states:

Applicant's remarks regarding these rejections are noted. Specifically, Applicant argues that the newly added limitation "said polycrystalline material is characterized by a degree of crystallinity and a degree of amorphous regions ... selected by selecting the composition of said additive and the amount of said additive" is not suggested by prior art.

Serial No. 09/727,615

Docket No. YOR919960050US3

Page 17 of 22

The Examiner respectfully submits that the above prior art inherently meets the newly claimed "product by process" type limitations regarding selecting the composition and amount of additive. The function of plasticizers and other additives is to tailor properties in order to achieve some specific desired result. Accordingly, the addition of such meets the claimed limitations.

Applicants respectfully disagree. A rejection for inherency can only support a 35 USC 102 rejection over a single reference. Inherency cannot support an obviousness rejection since what is inherent, is not explicitly taught. Thus, the only rejections that the Examiner's comments can support are the rejections of claims 1-20 and 22-24 under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by MacDiarmid et al. (5,484,884) and by Angelopoulos et al. (5,804,100), and the rejection of claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 12-17, 19-20 and 22-23 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Epstein et al. (4,913,867). (Angelopoulos et al. is not a reference for the reasons given above.)

Applicants' claims recite:

said polycrystalline material is characterized by a degree of crystallinity and a degree of amorphous regions, said degree of polycrystallinity and said degree of amorphous regions are selected by selecting the composition of said additive and the amount of said additive.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to specifically identify where this recitation can be found explicitly or inherently taught in MacDiarmid et al. and Epstein et al.

"Section 102(b) of Title 35 of the United States Code bars the issuance of a patent if "th invention was patented . . . more than one year prior to the date of the application for patent in the United States." "A claim is anticipated only if each and

S rial No. 09/727,615

Docket No. YOR919960050US3

every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (citation omitted). "It is well settled that a prior art reference may anticipate when the claim limitations not expressly found in that reference are nonetheless inherent in it. Under the principles of inherency, if the prior art necessarily functions in accordance with, or includes, the claimed limitations, it anticipates. In *re Cruciferous Sprout Litig.*, 301 F.3d 1343, 1349 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). "Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient. In *re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). In the statement above quoted from the office action the Examiner is merely speculating that applicants claims are inherent in the teachings of the cited references.

In view of the changes to the claims and the remarks herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the above-identified application. If the Examiner wishes to discuss the application further, or if additional information would be required, the undersigned will cooperate fully to assist in the prosecution of this application.

In response to Applicants' arguments in response to the PAFR, claim 24 (which was added in response to the PAFR) was allowed. The independent claim allowed in the parent is:

24. A structure comprising:

a polycrystalline material comprising crystallites of polyaniline with interstitial regions therebetween;

said polyaniline is selected from the group consisting of a precursors to an electrically conductive polyaniline and an electrically conductive polyaniline;

Serial No. 09/727,615

Docket No. YOR919960050US3

said interstitial regions comprise an amorphous material selected from the group consisting of polyaniline;

said amorphous material includes an additive in an amount from about 0.001% to about 90% by weight;

said additive is poly-co-dimethylaminopropyl siloxane.

The examiner allowed this claim stating "the instant specification discloses superior/unexpected results for compositions containing polyaniline and NMP 10% poly-co-dimethyl-propylamine siloxane". The references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest a method comprising a solvent and an additive. For the sake of argument herein, at best, following the Examiner's argument, a person of skill in the art would be motivated by the references to use 100% additive which Applicants' examples have shown do not achieve the desired result, crystallinity. Applicants' claims do not read on using 100% additive and thus do not read on what a person of skill in the art would be motivated to do by following the Examiner's argument. Applicants' argument in the paragraph is intended to rebut the Examiner's rational. As stated herein above, the cited references have no teaching or suggestion of increasing crystallinity or using an additive. Thus a person of skill in the art would not be motivated at all by these references to practice Applicants' claimed invention. Based on the references a person of skill in the art has no expectation of increasing crystallinity by using any additive.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper and any previous paper to deposit account 09-0468.

If the above-identified Examiner's Action is a final Action, and if the above-identified application will be abandoned without further action by Applicants, Applicants file a Notice of Appeal to the Board of Appeals and Interferences appealing

Serial No. 09/727,615

Docket No. YOR919960050US3

the final rejection of the claims in the above-identified Examiner's Action. Please charge deposit account 09-0468 any fee necessary to enter such Notice of Appeal.

In the event that this amendment does not result in allowance of all such claims, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone interview at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

MPEP 713.01 states in part as follows:

Where the response to a first complete action includes a request for an interview or a telephone consultation to be initiated by the examiner, ... the examiner, as soon as he or she has considered the effect of the response, should grant such request if it appears that the interview or consultation would result in expediting the case to a final action.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dr. Daniel P. Morris, Esq.
Reg. No. 32,053
Phone No. (914) 945-3217

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
P. O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

Serial No. 09/727,615

Docket No. YOR919960050US3

Page 21 of 22

ATTACHMENT A

Serial No. 09/727,615

Docket No. YOR919960050US3

Page 22 of 22

09/727,615

Hawley's Condensed Chemical Dictionary

ELEVENTH EDITION

Revised by

N. Irving Sax
and
Richard J. Lewis, Sr.



VAN NOSTRAND REINHOLD COMPANY

New York

09/727,615

HANDBOOK
By Philip
Here's the
for ALL
up proved
heavy
basic thes
557/90X

PUMP MAE
Edited by
1.103 pp.
Prepared
once cover
maintenan
organizing
handbook
aids, inclu
133/017

HANDBOOK
Edited by
A classic o
draulic str
branches o
examples o
155/380

HANDBOOK
Edited by
A systema
ency, and
shows you
more than
to everyth
he field.
187/643

ELECTRONIC
Edited by L
This famous
thoroughly
has, teach
han 90 of
nce for any
solved str
be the m
131/494

CHEMICAL E
Edited by R
llus., charts
Provides eve
olve today
question ab
the 25 sect
updated, rev
em-solving
194/789

Copyright © 1987 by Van Nostrand Reinhold Company Inc.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 86-23333
ISBN: 0-442-28097-1

All rights reserved. Certain portions of this work copyright © 1930, 1920, 1919 by The Chemical Catalog Co., Inc. and 1981, 1977, 1971, 1966, 1956, 1950 by Van Nostrand Reinhold Company Inc. No part of this work covered by the copyright hereon may be reproduced or used in any form or by any means—graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, taping, or information storage and retrieval systems—without permission of the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

Van Nostrand Reinhold Company Inc.
115 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10003

Van Nostrand Reinhold Company Limited
Molly Millars Lane
Wokingham, Berkshire RG11 2PY, England

Van Nostrand Reinhold
480 Latrobe Street
Melbourne, Victoria 3000, Australia

Macmillan of Canada
Division of Canada Publishing Corporation
164 Commander Boulevard
Agincourt, Ontario M1S 3C7, Canada

15 14 13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Condensed chemical dictionary.
Hawley's condensed chemical dictionary.

Rev. ed. of: The Condensed chemical dictionary.
10th ed./rev. by Gessner G. Hawley, 1981.
I. Chemistry—Dictionaries. I. Hawley, Gessner
Goodrich, 1905— II. Sax, N. Irving (Newton Irving)
III. Lewis, Richard J., Sr. IV. Title.
QD5.C5 1987 540'.3'21 86-23333
ISBN 0-442-28097-1

09/727,615

SOLVATION

1080

solvation. In the parlance of colloid chemistry, the adsorption of a microlayer or film of water or other solvent on individual dispersed particles of a solution or dispersion. The term "solvated hulls" has been used to describe such particles. It is also applied to the action of plasticizers on resin dispersions in plastisols. See also hydration (2).

Solvay process. (ammonia soda process).

Manufacture of sodium carbonate (soda ash, Na_2CO_3) from salt, ammonia, carbon dioxide, and limestone by an ingenious sequence of reactions involving recovery and reuse of practically all the ammonia and part of the carbon dioxide. Limestone is heated to produce lime and carbon dioxide. The latter is dissolved in water containing the ammonia and salt, with resultant precipitation of sodium bicarbonate. This is separated by filtration, dried, and heated to form normal sodium carbonate. The liquor from the bicarbonate filtration is heated and treated with lime to regenerate the ammonia. Calcium chloride is a major byproduct. *Note:* Because this process requires much energy and pollutes streams and rivers with chloride effluent many plants using it have closed, production being obtained from the natural deposits in the Western US.

"Solvenol,"TM TM for a group of monocyclic terpene hydrocarbons with minor amounts of terpene alcohols and ketones.

Use: General solvent, rubber reclaiming.

solvent. A substance capable of dissolving another substance (solute) to form a uniformly dispersed mixture (solution) at the molecular or ionic size level. Solvents are either polar (high dielectric constant) or non-polar (low dielectric constant). Water, the most common of all solvents, is strongly polar (dielectric constant 81), but hydrocarbon solvents are non-polar. Aromatic hydrocarbons have higher solvent power than aliphatics (alcohols). Other organic solvent groups are esters, ethers, ketones, amines, and nitrated and chlorinated hydrocarbons.

The chief uses of organic solvents are in the coatings field (paints, varnishes and lacquers), industrial cleaners, printing inks, extractive processes, and pharmaceuticals. Since many solvents are flammable and toxic to varying degrees, they contribute to air pollution and fire hazards. For this reason their use in coatings and cleaners has declined in recent years.

See individual compounds.

solvent, aprotic. A solvent that cannot act as a proton acceptor or donor i.e., as an acid or base.

solvent drying. Removal of water from metal surfaces by means of a solvent that displaces it

preferentially, as on precision equipment, electronic components, etc. Examples of solvents used are acetone, 1,1,2-trichloro-1,2,2-trifluoroethane, 1,1,1-trichloroethane.

solvent dye. See dye, solvent.

***solvent extraction.** A separation operation which may involve three types of mixture: (a) a mixture composed of two or more solids, such as a metallic ore; (b) a mixture composed of a solid and a liquid; (c) a mixture of two or more liquids. One or more components of such mixture are removed (extracted) by exposing the mixture to the action of a solvent in which the component to be removed is soluble. If the mixture consists of two or more solids, extraction is performed by percolation of an appropriate solvent through it. This procedure is also called leaching, especially if the solvent is water; coffee-making is an example. Synthetic fuels can be made from coal by extraction with a coal-derived solvent followed by hydrogenation.

In liquid-liquid extraction one or more components are removed from a liquid mixture by intimate contact with a second liquid which is itself nearly insoluble in the first liquid and dissolves the impurities and not the substance that is to be purified. In other cases the second liquid may dissolve, i.e., extract from the first liquid, the component that is to be purified, and leave associated impurities in the first liquid. Liquid-liquid extraction may be carried out by simply mixing the two liquids with agitation and then allowing them to separate by standing. It is often economical to use counter-current extraction, in which the two immiscible liquids are caused to flow past or through one another in opposite directions. Thus fine droplets of heavier liquid can be caused to pass downward through the lighter liquid in a vertical tube or tower.

The solvents used vary with the nature of the products involved. Widely used are water, hexane, acetone, isopropyl alcohol, furfural, xylene, liquid sulfur dioxide, and tributyl phosphate. Solvent extraction is an important method of both producing and purifying such products as lubricating and vegetable oils, pharmaceuticals and nonferrous metals.

solvent, latent. (co-solvent). An organic liquid that will dissolve nitrocellulose in combination with an active solvent. Latent solvents are usually alcohols and are used widely in nitrocellulose lacquers in a ratio of 1 part alcohol to 2 parts active solvent.

solvent naphtha. See naphtha (2b).

Solvent Red 73. See 4',5'-diiodofluorescein.